(25) Copies of judgments and decrees of appellate Courts, obtained from the subordinate Courts, should be required to be accepted for purposes of execution and evidence, in the same way as copies of documents obtained from registration offices. The Courts refused to recognise them now on the ground that they were copies of copies.

(26) The Courts generally delayed passing orders on applications for attachment of moveables or refused such applications, for want of sufficient room to keep the articles when they were brought after attachment. The defect in the matter of accommodation had to be removed at once.

(27) Some Courts were levying a court fee of half a rupee on applications for execution of decrees in which the value of the suit was less than Rs. 50, contrary to the clear provision of the fourth para of Article I (*a*) of Schedule II of the Regulation. The required fee was only 2 chackrams.

(28) Similarly, some Courts persisted in including interest on the value of suit and the court-costs as part of the value of the suit and charged a fee of one rupee, on the ground that such total value came to more than Rs. 50. The legitimate fee was only half a rupee under Article VII (*a*) of Schedule I.

(29) The jail process fee was now recovered at a uniform rate of Rs. $1\frac{1}{4}$ each in both civil and small cause suits. There was differential treatment in both classes of suits in all other matters. That benefit should be extended to process fees also.

(30) The head gumasthas of Courts should be required to obligatorily attest any affidavits presented to them. At present it was optional with them to do so or not.

(31) Under the existing arrangement, large amounts lapsed to the Government in the shape of process fees and witness' batta deposited by the parties. To avoid the enormous loss to the parties under those heads, a detailed list of such amounts should be caused to be published and affixed to a prominent part of the court-house once in a quarter.

Dewan's reply.—The representations of the Member will be referred to the High Court for remarks.

32. The need for giving translations of judgments of all Courts to applicants.

Mr. Padmanabhan Parameswaran (Member, Pathanapuram taluk) said that, in most of the Courts in the State, judgments were written in English and copies of the same given in that language to the applicants. Even five per cent of the parties were not acquainted with the English language. They could not understand the facts set out in the judgments and prefer appeals promptly. They had now to get the judgments translated into Malayalam, for which there were no facilities in the Mofussil stations. In most cases, the parties depended upon what their vakils in the original Courts might be able to tell them which, in many cases, turned out to their prejudice. If copies of the judgments were given in Malayalam, many appeal cases could have been avoided and much expense also saved to the people.

The Member pointed out that Section 196 of the Civil Procedure Code required the Courts to give attested translations of English judgments, if the parties should ask for them; but the provision was not being carried out in practice. The law also provided for judgments being written in the *language of the Court* or in English (Sections 195 and 273 of the Civil and Criminal Procedure Codes). He requested therefore that proper arrangements might be made to grant translations of English judgments to parties, in both Civil and Criminal Courts.

Dewan's reply.—The High Court will be asked for remarks on the Member's representation.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly